

THOMAS M. BONA, P.C.

THOMAS M. BONA
ANTHONY M. NAPOLI
JAMES C. MILLER
STEPHANIE BELLANTONI
MICHAEL KESTENBAUM
ROBERT H. STEINDORF
KIMBERLY C. SHEEHAN
EZRA SIMON
ROBERT M. LEFLAND
DEBRA C. SALVI
JOSEPH F. DURSI, JR.
ELLIOT GAZTAMBIDE, JR.
JAMES E. ROMER
MICHAEL A. FLAKE

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
123 Main Street
White Plains, New York 10601

TELEPHONE: (914) 428-1438
FACSIMILE: (914) 428-1413
E-MAIL: tmbona@bonapc.net

February 8, 2008

HUDSON VALLEY OFFICE

84 PLATTEKILL TURNPIKE Newburgh, New York 12550 (845) 562-5910

LONG ISLAND OFFICE

PMB #4002 50 Charles Lindbergh Blvd. Suite 400 Uniondale, New York 11553 (516) 227-1040

By E-Filing & Regular Mail

Honorable Stephen Robinson United States District Court 300 Quarropas Street, Room 633 White Plains, New York 10601

Re: Xand Corporation v. Strategic Energy, LLC

Case Number: 7:08-cv-513 Our File No. 1396-07 M20

Dear Judge Robinson:

This is in response to the objection by counsel for the plaintiff to the removal of this matter from the Supreme Court, Westchester County to this Court.

For diversity jurisdiction purposes, a corporation is deemed to be a citizen of any state in which it has been incorporated and, since 1958, also of the state where it has its principal place of business. This statement of the law regarding corporations for diversity jurisdiction purposes emanates from Justice Ginsburg in Wachovia Bank v. Schmidt, 546 U.S. 303 at 307, 126 S.Ct. 941 at 945 (2006).

As Justice Ginsburg stated but one year earlier in <u>Lincoln Property v. Roche</u>, 546 U.S. 81, 126 S.Ct. 606 at 616 (2005):

For cases of the kind (Xand has) instituted, Congress has provided simply and only this instruction: 'A corporation shall be deemed to be a citizen of any state by which it has been incorporated and of the state where has its principal place of business. The jurisdictional rule governing here is unambiguous and is not amenable to judicial enlargement.'

The defendant removing party, as stated in the notice of removal, is a Delaware corporation and maintains its principal place of business in Pittsburgh, PA. The parties

Honorable Stephen Robinson United State District Court

February 8, 2008 Page 2

are diverse, notwithstanding the affidavit of the president of the plaintiff. Annexed is an affidavit from Carl W. Boyd, Manager of Regulatory Licensing and Compliance of Strategic identifying the corporate headquarters as located in Pittsburgh.

Mr. Weinstein no doubt overlooked the contract between the parties which is annexed to the complaint. Paragraph 14 of the contract directs that any notice or other document to be given or served "shall be delivered to the appropriate address specified below". Surely, if Strategic had its principal place of business in the City of New York, a New York City address would have been provided. Instead, any notice or other documents are to be delivered to Strategic Energy in Pittsburgh, PA.

The verified complaint, signed by Mr. Weinstein, alleges in ¶2 that Strategic is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with "its principal office in New York at 150 E. 52nd Street, New York, NY". While a corporation may have an office in many states, its "principal place of business" is very specific. In this case, the "principal place of business" is in Pittsburgh.

Mr. Weinstein contends that the defendant "maintains a principal place of business" in New York City. The "principal place of business" language is a term of art and one which has legal significance. Mr. Weinstein makes scant and passing references to the defendant having somehow held itself out as having a "principal place of business" in New York City. No support whatsoever is offered for his conclusion on what is, essentially, a question of law.

The reason that counsel for the plaintiff cites China Basin v. Allendale, 818 F. Supp. 1301 is not readily apparent. Certainly, the geographic location of the decision, coupled with its age, is perhaps indicative of the lack of applicability of China Basin to the case at bar. The case before that District Court apparently dealt with the "principal place of business" of an inactive corporation.

Conclusion

Removal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1441(a) is appropriate. The amount in controversy, as set forth in the plaintiff's own complaint, exceeds \$75,000. The parties are, by the admission contained within the complaint, citizens of separate states which satisfies the complete-diversity requirement. Jurisdiction is, thus, properly laid in this Court and the request to remand back to the state court should be denied.

Finally, there is a motion to dismiss already filed with this Court. Pursuant to the

Filed 02/08/2008

Page 3 of 3

Honorable Stephen Robinson United State District Court February 8, 2008 Page 3

rules of this court I have contacted, both by telephone and e-mail, counsel for the plaintiff requesting that we agree upon a briefing schedule. The only response has been the letter application for a remand.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS M. BONA, P.C.

Thomas M. Ron

TMB:rtl enclosure

cc: Arthur Morrison, Esq. Attorney for Plaintiff

11 Skyline Drive

Hawthorne, New York 10532

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
XAND CORPORATION,
Plaintiff, AFFIDAVIT
-against-
STRATEGIC ENERGY, LLC,
Defendant.
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA) COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY)
Carl W. Boyd, being duly sworn, hereby deposes and says:
1. I am Manager of Regulatory Licensing and Compliance at Strategic
Energy, LLC. ("Strategic"). This affidavit is submitted in support of the opposition
to the application to remand this matter to the Supreme Court, Westchester County
It is based upon my personal knowledge of the facts contained herein.
2. Strategic is incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware.
3. The principal place of business and corporate headquarters of
Strategic is in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
4. As the principal place of business of Strategic, the following
activities, for example, take place:

Executive meetings;

- Decisions regarding business operations within the scope established by law:
- Development of products and consultative services, human resource, and corporate service systems policies and procedures;
- Contractual, regulatory and employment issues are addressed.
- There are branch offices in states where Strategic conducts some of its 5. business. There is, indeed, an office in New York City. The purpose of that office is to facilitate the business purpose of Strategic. It provides us with the opportunity for local interaction between the representatives of the company, its customers and potential customers. To be sure, however, the employees of Strategic, and any independent contractors associated with Strategic take their direction, management and control from the corporate headquarters in Pittsburgh functioning as the principal place of business for Strategic.

Sworn to before me this

Case 7:08-cv-00513-SCR

day of February, 2008

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania-

Notary Public

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Notarial Seal

Kevin C. Macken, Notary Public -City Of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County My Commission Expires Dec. 30, 2009

Member, Pennsylvania Association of Notaries